Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005

Message Text

PAGE 01 NATO 00122 01 OF 02 101922Z

44
ACTION EUR-25

INFO OCT-01 IO-14 ISO-00 EURE-00 SSO-00 NSCE-00 USIE-00

INRE-00 CIAE-00 PM-07 INR-10 L-03 NEA-10 NSAE-00

PA-04 RSC-01 PRS-01 SPC-03 TRSE-00 SAJ-01 H-03 NSC-10

SS-20 ACDA-19 OIC-04 AEC-11 AECE-00 OMB-01 DRC-01

/149 W
---------- 066346
O P 101815Z JAN 74
FM USMISSION NATO
TO SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 3512
SECDEF WASHDC IMMEDIATE
INFO AMEMBASSY BONN PRIORITY
AMEMBASSY LONDON PRIORITY
AMEMBASSY BRUSSELS
USMISSION GENEVA
USMISSION VIENNA PRIORITY
USNMR SHAPE

S E C R E T SECTION 1 OF 2 USNATO 0122

E.O. 11652: GDS
TAGS: PARM, NATO
SUBJECT: MBFR: COMMENTS ON REVISED SPC DRAFT ON STABILIZING MEASURES

GENEVA FOR USDEL CSCE

VIENNA FOR USDEL MBFR

REF: A. STATE 004067 B. USNATO 0028

SUMMARY: SPC DRAFTING GROUP ON JANUARY 9 PRODUCED REVISED DRAFT
ON STABILIZING MEASURES (NEW TEXT SEPTEL). COMMITTEE RESOLVED
SOME ISSUES AND ACCEPTED SEVERAL CHANGES PROPOSED REFTEL A.
SIGNIFICAT DIFFERENCES REMAIN, HOWEVER, OVER:

SECRET

PAGE 02 NATO 00122 01 OF 02 101922Z

-- THE EFFECT OF STABILIZING MEASURES ON FORCE MOVEMENTS IN TIMES
OF TENSION (PARA 3);

-- MILTILATERALIZATION OF PRE-ANNOUNCEMENTS (PARA 4);

Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005

Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005

-- AND DEFINITION OF EXERCISES (PARA 13).

DETAILED MISSION COMMENTS, KEYED TO NEW TEXT, CONTAINED
BELOW. DRAFTING GROUP WILL MEET ON WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 16,
TO PREPARE FINAL DRAFT FOR SPC CONSIDERATION, PROBABLY EARLY
IN THE WEEK OF JANUARY 21-25. ACTION REQUESTED: GUIDANCE,
IF POSSIBLE ON ALL REMAINING ISSUES, IN TIME FOR JANUARY 16
DRAFTING GROUP MEETING.END SUMMARY:

1. PARA 2: FRG AND CANADIAN REPS DROPPED THEIR ALTERNATIVE
FINAL SENTENCES (REF B) AND ACCEPTED US REP'S POINT THAT
PRESENT PARA 2(A) APPEARED TO COVER THEIR CONCERNS BETTER.

2. PARA 3: FIRST BRACKETTED PARAGRAPH UNDER "OR" SUGGESTED,
NOT VERY CONFIDENTLY, BY UK REP. SECOND SUGGESTED BY DUTCH REP,
WHO BASED IT UPON THE LANGUAGE IN THE FIRST PARAGRAPH OF THE
RECENT WORKING GROUP COMMENTARY (USNATO 6276). UK REP REACTED
FAVORABLY TO DUTCH PROPOSAL, WHICH HE BELIEVED MIGHT COMPLEMENT
AND NOT REPLACE UK SUGGESTION. CANADIAN REP SAID THAT OTTAWA
HAD CAREFULLY REVIEWED THE POST-WAR HISTORY OF SACEUR REACTIONS
AND THE USE OF THE NATO ALERT SYSTEM DURING TIMES OF EAST-WEST
TENSION AND OBSERVED THAT EVEN DURING THE CZECH CRISIS, NATO
FORCES ONLY INCREASED THEIR STATE VIGILANCE AND THAT SACEUR HAD
NEVER DEPLOYED FORCES IN RESPONSE TO SOVIET MOVES IN EASTERN
EUROPE. THUS, OTTAWA SUPPORTED U.S. VIEW THAT THESE STABILIZING
MEASURES WOULD NOT INHIBIT SACEUR'S CAPABILITIES, SINCE ANY
CONDITIONS IN WHICH HE WOULD MOVE FORCES WOULD BE SO EXTREME THAT
ANY AGREEMENT ON STABILIZING MEASURES WOULD CERTAINLY HAVE BEEN
CALLED INTO QUESTION. CANADIAN REP SAID SAME VIEW WOULD APPLY
TO PARA 13. SHAPE AND MC REPS REACTED STRONGLY AGAINST
CANADIAN ANALYSIS AND SAID THAT THEY COULD NOT ACCEPT
SACEUR'S RESPONSE TO THE CZECH CRISIS AS A VALID PRECEDENT
OR GUIDELINE, SINCE SOVIET FORCES ON THAT OCCASION WERE CLEARLY
DIRECTED AGAINST AN EAST EUROPEAN STATE AND NOT AGAINST THE WEST.
(COMMENT: SEVERAL REPS REACTED FAVORABLY TO LANGUAGE PROPOSED
BY DUTCH REP. REQUEST GUIDANCE ON A FORMULATION ACCEPT-
SECRET

PAGE 03 NATO 00122 01 OF 02 101922Z

ABLE TO U.S. END COMMENT)

3. PARA 4: BELGIAN AND DUTCH REPS CONTINUED TO THINK THAT ALL
PARTIES TO THE AGREEMENT SHOULD BE DIRECT RECIPIENTS OF PRE-
NOTIFICATIONS. THIS WAS ONE OF THE RARE INSTANCES IN WHICH
OTHER ALLIES COULD BE SEEN TO BE ACTIVE IN PHASE I OF MBFR
AND PUBLIC OPINION WOULD FAIL TO UNDERSTAND IF ALLIED GOVERN-
MENTS DID NOT RECEIVE SOVIET NOTIFICATIONS. U.S. REP ARGUED THAT
INCLUSION OF OTHERS WOULD PROVIDE SOVIETS WITH OPPORTUNITY FOR
MAKING DEMANDS ON ALLIES. FACT THAT DIRECT PARTICIPANTS WOULD
BE PARTIES TO THE AGREEMENT AND BE INVOLVED IN ITS NEGOTIATION
WOULD GIVE MULTILATERAL CAHARACTER TO MEASURES, AND ALLIES WOULD
IN ANY CASE RECEIVE INFORMATION THROUGH INTERNAL ALLIANCE

Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005

Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005

MECHANISM. IN SHIFT AWAY FROM EARLIER EMPHASIS ON MULTILATERAL-
IZATION, FRG REP SAID THAT BONN NOW SHARED U.S. VIEW THAT U.S.
AND USSR SHOULD ONLY NOTIFY EACH OTHER. UK AGREED WITH FRG.

4. PARA 5: UK AND FRG REPS CALLED FOR DELETING THIS PARAGRAPH,
SINCE FIRST SENTENCE COULD BE COVERED IN PARA 7 AND SECOND
SENTENCE PROVIDED POTENTIALLY MAJOR LOOPHOLE, SINCE SOVIETS
COULD DEFINE "INDIVIDUAL PERSONNEL" TO THEIR OWN LIKING. U.S.
REP SAID THAT FIRST SENTENCE CONTAINED IMPORTANT DETAIL OF
MONTHLY LISTING AND SHOULD BE RETAINED. SECOND SENTENCE
MIGHT NEED FURTHER CLARIFICATION, ALTHOUGH IT MADE OBVIOUS POINT.
(COMMENT: TO MAKE SECOND SENTENCE CLEARER, MISSION SUGGESTS
REVISION ALONG FOLLOWING LINES: "SUCH NUMBERS MAY EXCLUDE
PERSONNEL ENTERING (OR LEAVING) ON INDIVIDUAL ORDERS FOR
LEAVE, TRANSFER, OR TRAINING WHO ARE..." A SIMILAR CHANGE
WOULD BE MADE TO FINAL SENTENCE OF PARA 11. END COMMENT)

SECRET

PAGE 01 NATO 00122 02 OF 02 101925Z

43
ACTION EUR-25

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 IO-14 EURE-00 SSO-00 NSCE-00 USIE-00

INRE-00 CIAE-00 PM-07 INR-10 L-03 NEA-10 NSAE-00

PA-04 RSC-01 PRS-01 SPC-03 TRSE-00 SAJ-01 H-03 NSC-10

SS-20 ACDA-19 OIC-04 AEC-11 AECE-00 OMB-01 DRC-01

/149 W

---------- 066361
O P 101815Z JAN 74
FM USMISSION NATO
TO SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 3513
SECDEF WASHDC IMMEDIATE
INFO AMEMBASSY BONN PRIORITY
AMEMBASSY LONDON PRIORITY
AMEMBASSY BRUSSELS
USMISSION GENEVA
USMISSION VIENNA PRIORITY
USNMR SHAPE

S E C R E T SECTION 2 OF 2 USNATO 0122

5. PARA 6: COMMITTEE ACCEPTED U.S. ARGUMENTS (REF A) AGAINST
"DEPARTURE FROM" AND "EXIT FROM" AND AGREED TO DROP THOSE
PHRASES. ON 24-HOUR VS. 7 DAY QUESTION, U.S. REP DREW ON
REF A, PARTICULARLY ON MONITORING CAPABILITY POINT, AND NOTED
THAT PATTERN OF ANNUAL NOTIFICATION, MONTHLY LISTINGS AND 60
DAYS ADVANCE NOTICE OF CHANGES SHOULD PROVIDE ADQUATE SAFEGUARDS.
MC REP, WHO HAD EARLIER FAVORED 7-DAY PERIOD, AGREED WITH U.S.

Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005

Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005

FRG REP SAID HE WOULD REFER THESE ARGUMENTS TO BONN. FRG FIRMLY FAVORED SEVEN DAY PERIOD, HOWEVER, SINCE IT WOULD PREVENT SOVIETS FROM MASSING NEARLY 150,000 TROOPS IN ONE MONTH (E.G. THOUGH SLIGHTLY LESS THAN 5,000 A DAY) WITHOUT GIVING NOTICE. UK AGREED WITH FRG. (COMMENT: IF FRG AND UK CONTINUE TO PRESS FOR SEVEN DAYS, REQUEST GUIDANCE ON WHETHER WE COULD ACCEPT A TWO-DAY OR THREE-DAY PERIOD. END COMMENT)

SECRET

PAGE 02 NATO 00122 02 OF 02 101925Z

6. PARA 9: BASED ON U.S.CONCERNS OVER IMPACT OF ALTERNATIVE WORDING (REF B) ON USE OF U.S. FORCES FOR CONTINGENCIES OUTSIDE THE AREA AND UK REP'S OBSERVATION THAT THE PROPOSED ALTERNATIVE LANGUAGE (REF B) WOULD PLACE FOUR OBLIGATIONS ON U.S. INSTEAD OF ONLY TWO, COMMITTEE AGREED TO RETURN T* ORIGINAL LANGUAGE. MC REP CAUTIONED AGAIN, HOWEVER, AGAINST THE ADMINISTRATIVE COMPLEXITY OF THIS ARRANGEMENT.

7. PARA 12: COMMITTEE DID NOT ACCEPT U.S. ARGUMENT THAT PHRASE "IN WHICH A DIVISION OR 10,000 OR MORE" WAS REDUNDANT, SINCE IT IS MEANT, NOT TO DEFINE "MAJOR EXERCISE" AS IS DONE IN PARA 13, BUT TO MAKE CLEAR THAT U.S. WOULD NOTIFY ONLY THOSE EXERCISES IN WHICH A DIVISION OR 10,000 OR MORE OF ITS OWN PERSONNEL TAKE PART. FOR EXAMPLE, IF THESE WERE A LARGE NATO EXERCISE IN WHICH THE U.S. HAD A SMALL NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS, THE U.S. WOULD NOT BE REQUIRED TO PRE-ANNOUNCE IT.

8. PARA 12(C): SEE PARA 13(3).

9. PARA 13: MC AND UK REPS ARGUED STRONGLY FOR INCLUSION OF "FIELD TRAINING." WITHOUT THIS QUALIFICATION, DEFINITION WOULD APPLY TO ALL MOVEMENTS, WHICH COULD INHIBIT BOTH SACEUR AND NATIONAL FORCES MOVING INTO OR WITHIN THE AREA. U.S. REP DREW ON REF A. (COMMENT: ALLIES ARE READY TO ACCEPT U.S. TACTICAL ARGUMENTS VIS-A-VIS SOVIETS, BUT ARE MORE CONCERNED OVER THE EFFECT ON THEIR OWN FORCES AND ON SACEUR'S CAPABILITIES. UK AND MC REPS HAVE TOLD MISSION PRIVATELY, HOWEVER, THAT THEY MIGHT BE SATISFIED WITH FOOTNOTE FOR INTERNAL ALLIED USE WHICH MAKES CLEAR THAT ON THE ALLIED SIDE THIS DEFINITION WOULD ONLY APPLY TO DEPLOYMENTS "FOR FIELD TRAINING." REQUEST GUIDANCE ON ACCEPTABILITY OF SUCH A FOOTNOTE. END COMMENT)

10. PARAS 12 AND 14: COMMITTEE ACCEPTED REINSERTION OF FORMER SUBPARAS 12A AND E.

11. PARA 13(3): UK AGREED TO DROP PARA 12(C), IF 24-HOUR PERIOD COULD BE USED INSTEAD OF MORE RESTRICTIVE 12-HOUR PERIOD IN THIS PARAGRAPH. (COMMENT: REQUEST GUIDANCE ON ACCEPTABILITY OF 24 HOURS. END COMMENT.)

12. PARA 15: SHAPE REP REPORTED THAT FOLLOWING FORMAL REVIEW

SECRET

Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005

Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005

OF EARLIER STAFF-LEVEL REPORT (USNATO 6269), SHAPE NOW PREFERRED "50,000" IN LIEU OF "35,000." THERE WERE INSTANCES--
E.G., U.S. "REFORGER" FORCES DEPLOYED INTO EUROPE INTERFACING WITH STATIONED U.S. FORCES--IN WHICH THE TOTAL FORCES INVOLVED COULD BE MORE THAN 35,000. (COMMENT: REQUEST GUIDANCE ON ACCEPTABILITY OF 50,000. END COMMENT)

13. PARA 15(C): FRG REP RPOPOSED "TWELVE" AND ADDED FOOTNOTE (2). (COMMENT: REQUEST GUIDANCE. END COMMENT)

14. PARA 16: FRG REP ACCEPTED ORIGINAL LANGUAGE AND DROPPED BRACKETS, IN VIEW OF ADDITION OF "BLANKET ANNOUNCEMENT" IN PARA 12(B)(3).

15. PARA 20: FRG REP SAID THAT BONN WAS STUDYING THIS PROBLEM CLOSELY AND IT WOULD BE TWO WEEKS OR MORE BEFORE HE WOULD HAVE DEFINITIVE INSTRUCTIONS. HE ADDED FOOTNOTE, HOWEVER, TO REFLECT FRG VIEW THAT STUDY OF THESE DETAILS, WHICH NEED ONLY BE NEGOTIATED MUCH LATER, SHOULD NOT DELAY TABLING OF ALLIED PROPOSALS.
RUMSFELD

SECRET

<< END OF DOCUMENT >>

Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005

Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptioning: X
Capture Date: 11 JUN 1999
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: n/a
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Draft Date: 10 JAN 1974
Decaption Date: 01 JAN 1960
Decaption Note:
Disposition Action: RELEASED
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Authority: garlanwa
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Date: 28 MAY 2004
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1974ATO00122
Document Source: ADS
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: n/a
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: 11652 GDS
Errors: n/a
Film Number: n/a
From: NATO
Handling Restrictions: n/a
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1974/newtext/t19740173/abbryson.tel
Line Count: 241
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE
Office: n/a
Original Classification: SECRET
Original Handling Restrictions: n/a
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 5
Previous Channel Indicators:
Previous Classification: SECRET
Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Reference: A. STATE 004067 B. USNATO 0028
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Authority: garlanwa
Review Comment: n/a
Review Content Flags:
Review Date: 19 JUL 2001
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review History: RELEASED <19-Jul-2001 by boyleja>; APPROVED <10 APR 2002 by garlanwa>
Review Markings:

Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
30 JUN 2005

Review Media Identifier:
Review Referrals: n/a
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
Secure: OPEN
Status: NATIVE
Subject: MBFR: COMMENTS ON REVISED SPC DRAFT ON STABILIZING MEASURES
TAGS: PARM, NATO
To: STATE
SECDEF INFO BONN
LONDON
BRUSSELS
GENEVA
VIENNA
USNMR SHAPE

Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005

Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005

Type: TE
Markings: Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005

Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005